

The Day Goldberg Told the UN We Were Only Fighting to Save Freedom in Vietnam

"We seek only to insure the independence of South Vietnam . . . and opportunity for its people to determine their own future . . . by the principles of self-determination."

—Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations, Sept. 23.

"At Da Nang, three persons were executed by a South Vietnamese firing squad. The execution, held in a soccer stadium, was postponed at the last minute until midnight . . . because news photographers refused to obey an order that no pictures be taken until the final shot had been fired. The three were among five persons arrested Monday during a demonstration by about 200 persons in downtown

Da Nang. They were protesting crop damage from artillery fire and air strikes by U.S. forces."

—Same day, Chicago Daily News from Saigon.

" . . . the fourth man would be executed later, but at the moment he was giving valuable information. He was described as 'a singing bird.' The fifth demonstrator, a woman, was sentenced to life in prison although the demonstration had been so small that few were even aware of it."

—From UPI account same day Washington Daily News.

These are the people now described as "terrorists" for whose death two Americans were killed in reprisal.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 32

OCTOBER 4, 1965

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Grimy Foundations of the UN's Shaky Success

A few plain observations, free from humbug, may help to clarify the continued crisis over Kashmir. The first concerns the role of China. This is the second dispute on China's borders which the U.S., this time with the aid of the U.S.S.R., is trying to settle without Chinese participation. If it means peace, we hope they succeed. But in the long run, China cannot be shut out of such problems. It is as if Russia and China, between them, working through the UN, were settling a quarrel between Mexico and Panama while excluding us not only from the negotiations but even from the UN itself. We would make trouble in such a case. So, within the limits of its power, is China. A further point must be noted. The border quarrel over Sikkim between China and India concerns an historic invasion route; troops can move south through it into India, or North through it into China as Britain did in the 19th Century. The disputed Ladakh area in the north-west adjoining Kashmir also offers an historic invasion route from Western Asia into Tibet. The Chinese feel about our intrusion in these borderland quarrels as we did about Maximilian in Mexico.

Kashmir and Suez

Our self-congratulations about using the UN in the Kashmir dispute are becoming nauseous. This is another case of using the UN when it serves our purposes to do so, as in the Suez and Congo affairs. We use the UN as a buffer where we do not wish to take too open a position in a quarrel between friends, and where the quarrel threatens to upset our over-all strategy in our own bigger quarrels with Russia or China. In the Suez crisis, we didn't want to upset the oil-bearing Arabs or too much antagonize the British and French. Long before the Kashmir fighting broke out, we turned hostile to Pakistan when it left the cold war camp, sought Chinese aid as a counterpoise to India and gave China air landing rights. This broke the wall of containment around China and enabled its plane services to reach Africa and Europe. We'd like Pakistan humbled just enough to bring it back in our camp, but not enough to drive it further into the arms of China.

Strange Lovers of Peace

"The members of the UN, under the Charter, share a common responsibility to demonstrate to those who use violence that violence does not pay."

—Ambassador Goldberg at the UN Sept. 23 arguing against admission of Communist China.

"Justice Goldberg can't have it both ways. Who is at war and who isn't? Are the Chinese fighting anywhere? They may be doing some propaganda needling here and there. But it's you Americans in Vietnam and British in Sarawak and Aden, and Indians in Kashmir. . . . Now take Mr. Goldberg's argument against self-defense. . . . Was it self-defense when Britain and France invaded Suez? When Russians started mowing down people in Budapest? Was it self-defense to go into the Dominican Republic?"

—An African diplomat from one of the 10 nations backing Peking's admission to the UN, as quoted in the Christian Science Monitor next day.

This would happen if we openly shelved the long promised plebiscite in Kashmir; this can be done more tactfully through the UN. Neither we nor the Russians will press for the plebiscite, since that would antagonize India and both see India as an ally against China. Yet the coincidence of Russo-American interests in Kashmir, as in the Suez crisis, may again save peace and establish a valuable peace-keeping precedent. The UN, like every other edifice, must be forgiven its grimy foundations.

Just as the big powers have an interest in preventing war between India and Pakistan, so the small and middle powers have an interest in preventing war between the U.S. and China. They see China's admission to the UN as a means of ameliorating China's intransigence, which is more a matter of words than deeds anyway. But here we refuse to reciprocate, and Ambassador Goldberg's opening address to the General Assembly was given a cool reception not only because of its banality but because of its self-righteousness about China.

(Continued on Page Four)

AFL-CIO's Latin Labor Affiliate Only Latin Voice Raised In Favor of Interventionism

ADA's Don Edwards Says Selden Resolution Had "Tacit Support" of LBJ

Those members of Congress who understand the dangers implicit in our Latin American interventionism ought not to wait for a new crisis before speaking out again. A campaign of education is essential before new crises arise. One is building up over the government's attempt to organize an OAS force which, under the guise of peace-keeping, can be used as an interventionist tool against governments we consider too left for safety. The opposition to such a force is strong in every Latin country except those like Brazil, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Guatemala which are ruled by the military with our aid. The second crisis may arise in the Dominican Republic if and when it looks as if Bosch or a Bosch candidate may win over Balaguer, the Trujillo leftover our oil and sugar interests favor.

Even Pro-American Papers Protest

The Selden resolution upholding unilateral intervention against the threat of "subversion" should be regarded as a blessing in disguise for it has awakened the whole hemisphere to the danger. Even conservative papers in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico, which normally support U.S. policy, have condemned it. Conservative legislators joined moderates in the unanimous resolution of condemnation passed by the parliaments of Peru and Colombia. The only voice in favor of the Selden resolution came from ORIT, the Latin American affiliate of the AFL-CIO (*Wash. Post*, Sept. 26, from Mexico City). Dodd criticized Fulbright for not quoting ORIT's statement in favor of the Dominican intervention!

When Rosenthal (D. N.Y.) told the House in the debate over the Selden resolution Sept. 20 that it threatened anarchy, he was not exaggerating. The resolution would allow any country in the hemisphere to intervene when it saw a danger of "subversion" in a neighbor. Uruguay, the oldest democratic regime in the hemisphere, has been alarmed by indications that the Brazilian and Argentine military were conspiring to intervene in Uruguay. The military we arm can carry on little imperialistic ventures of their own under cover of so vague a mandate as that afforded by the Selden resolution. Alarm is increased because our favorite Latin ally is now Brazil where the military are moving toward a Salazar type dictator-

The Alliance Against Progress

"The big bottleneck to progress . . . is the factions in the nations of Latin America that cling to the past and to their present power. . . . So long as these elements are aided and encouraged by the U.S. military aid missions and CIA . . . they will continue to block essential economic reform. . . . Many of these Latin American oligarchies and would-be dictators are using the American military to stay in power. They count on its gullibility, and our overriding obsession with Communism, to hold back the tide that would otherwise sweep them away."

—Morse in the Senate supporting Fulbright, Sept. 16.

ship, and where the *Tribuna da Imprensa*, organ of the nationalist Lacerda has just published the text of an alleged secret document in which Tom Mann offered Brazil the command of an inter-American military force (*Le Monde*, Sept. 23).

Brademas (D. Ind.) one of those who spoke out against the Selden resolution (passed 315-52) told the House he had been unable to get the State Department to say whether it was for or against the resolution. This was the line to which the liberals held in the debate to avoid a frontal attack on the Administration. But Don Edwards (D. Cal.) to his credit let out the truth when he told the ADA's national board (*Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 26) that the resolution had the "tacit approval" of the Administration.

That lack of candor Fulbright charged against the Administration extends to Congress. Clark (D. Pa.) in a speech supporting Fulbright complained (Sept. 17) that even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was unable to hear three key Administration witnesses, albeit in executive session. One was John Bartlow Martin, who profited from his quick stay as Johnson's emissary in the Dominican Republic by selling a story to *Life* magazine which Clark called "highly inaccurate" but which pandered to the alarmist views spread by Luce. The second was special Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. The third was McGeorge Bundy, the President's special emissary. "At one point," Clark told the Senate, "he said he would come and have tea with us, but then he refused even to do that."

A Rare Friendly U.S. Report on Cuba: It Illustrates What Fulbright Meant

"Cuba today is not the island of misery, oppression and starvation pictured by many Americans. Neither has Cuba achieved the unity and economic success claimed by the supporters of Fidel Castro. However, a 3-1/2 week visit traveling from one end of the Communist outpost to the other suggests that the present reality lies closer to the Castro hopes. . . . His popularity is immense. . . .

"The basic reason Fidel and his revolution continue to be popular despite Cuba's many difficulties is that the people now have something of overriding value that they previously lacked—dignity. Part of the Cuban resentment stems from the feeling that Cuban dignity had been affronted by U.S. economic domination. . . .

"Negroes, some 30% of the population, are particularly pro-Fidel. . . . Formerly landless farm workers . . . are another source of total support. . . . Before Castro, Cuban agriculture was dominated by immense sugar plantations owned mostly by foreigners, particularly Americans. . . .

Much of the expropriated land was given to landless peasants. . . .

"Despite the success of the Castro regime, there are many opponents who feel that the improvements will be more than cancelled out by the permanent loss of any hope of ever building a free society. They are men who would have built the liberal, democratic Cuba which American policy-makers say they want. But before the revolution, they were unable to make headway, primarily because of the indifference and insensitivity of the American government. . . .

"We must understand that it is in our national interest to encourage certain revolutionary changes, even when they include nationalizing American business holdings. If we attempt to block the needed changes, we may delay them temporarily, but they will inevitably come, dictated then by a new Fidel Castro."

—C. K. McClatchy, associate editor of the Sacramento Bee, condensed in the Washington Post Sept. 26.

Only Strong Protest Can Keep Us From Cultivating the Inhumane Arts in Vietnam

Arthur Miller Sets An Example All Sensitive Americans Should Follow

We salute dramatist Arthur Miller for his telegram ("When the guns boom, the arts die") to the White House, rejecting an invitation to witness the signing by the President of the Arts and Humanities bill. Like Poet Robert Lowell four months ago, Mr. Miller was protesting the Vietnamese war. We believe his example should be followed by every intellectual. The "humanities" are being destroyed without mercy by our military; the arts for which we are becoming world famous are the arts of burning out villages with napalm and spreading carpets of devastation with B-52s. We urge everyone to participate in his nearest demonstration Oct. 15 for Vietnam Day and to come to Washington in the march being planned by SANE and other organizations Nov. 27.

How "Humane" We Can Get

A numbed public opinion is passively accepting the use of "non-lethal" gases to "flush out" villagers from air raid shelters and tunnels "humanely." If the Pentagon wants to be humane, let it end the use of napalm and indiscriminate bombing, both violations of Geneva conventions. If "non-lethal" gases are accepted, the next step, also on 'humane' grounds, will be to use Vietnam as a testing place for new means of chemical bacteriological warfare. The campaign to sell these new weapons began earlier this year, and any encouragement will revive it. Some Americans in Vietnam are sickened by what we are doing but many, as Georges Chaffard reported in *L'Express*, Sept. 26, take the killings lightly, with an undercurrent of racism. When he wondered at the prodigality with which we shower bombs on minor targets, "American aviators explained laughingly that orders are to get rid of old stocks which date as far back as the war against Japan, and to hurry up before they become unusable."

When we knew we were losing the war, the answer to peace talk was that we had to have a situation of strength. Now that we think we're winning, the military object to peace talks because they think they can impose terms. So Lodge from Saigon (according to an exclusive by Arnold Beichman in the

The Stalemate

"The leaders of the National Liberation Front . . . must revise their previous views. There will be no new Dien Bien Phu in South Vietnam. . . . The American bases have a permanent character . . . their liquidation is no more possible than that of Guantanamo. . . . On the other hand, the Americans can do little against the deterioration of the political climate, against the non-existence of any power in Saigon, against the rise of anti-American sentiments, against the presence among the rural masses of thousands of politico-administrative cadres who have patiently woven for the Viet Cong the spider's web of a clandestine State apparatus. It is too late to try for a 'reconquest of hearts'. . . . Sooner or later the Americans will have to allow the Front of Liberation to find legal political expression and to participate in power. The Viet Cong and its allies will have to accommodate themselves to the American military presence at certain points along the coast. So much is obvious. But men may refuse to see the obvious for 20 years."

—Georges Chaffard in *L'Express* (Paris), Sept. 26.

New York Herald-Tribune, Sept. 27) has protested Ambassador Goldberg's statement to the UN that we were ready for "peaceful discussions." It may be a good many weeks before we know how much of recent stories about military victories were true and how much malarky. U.S. correspondents are inhibited but British correspondents are franker. The *London Observer* (Sept. 19) reported from Saigon that newsmen feel much of what they are getting is "transparently misleading." The *London Times* (Sept. 24) in a lengthy special from Saigon says recent victory reports, like that of Chu Lai, have left some observers skeptical. Not only reporters but European military attaches are reported talking of boycotting briefings described as "painfully vacuous." Grimmer truths may be seen in Senator Stennis's speech at Colombia, Miss. (*Wash. Star*, Sept. 26), saying we may have to double our forces to 250,000 and keep our troops in Vietnam for 15 years. He wants the war on poverty suspended or curtailed to meet the bill.

The Toll of Suffering and Hatred Exacted by Our Bombing Policies in Vietnam

"I have found very widespread disaffection with respect to both sides on the part of the Vietnamese people, and I would estimate that 80 to 90% of the people of Vietnam feel no real stake in the war. . . . Their outlook is focused on the need for a safe night's sleep and the opportunity to keep a reasonable proportion of what their labor produces, but neither side affords them either of these luxuries. Feelings are masked both by reason of Asian mores and of harshly enforced regulations against dissent, but it is safe to say that the American presence is widely misunderstood, widely mistrusted and probably widely resented. . . .

"There are two policies now being followed that have a bearing on the problem. . . . The first of these is the 'no-sanctuary' policy of the Government of Vietnam and the U.S. forces, and its companion 'open target areas' policy. I can understand the military basis for the first of these policies which permits a commander in the field to call up air attack support when his men are being fired upon or when he believes Viet Cong are taking refuge in a village, but more than military considerations are in order. I

deeply believe the policy is wrong morally, shortsighted pragmatically and disastrous in terms of the bitterness it is creating among civilian Vietnamese, both those whom it drives to become refugees and those who stay behind. I can see even less justification for the 'open target areas' policy, under which any aircraft, unable to dispose of their explosives on the designated target, and prohibited from landing with explosives aboard, is instructed to drop them within certain large Viet Cong areas—on village, rice paddy, man, or beast, wherever whim dictates."

—Stephen G. Cary, American Friends Service Committee, at the Senate Vietnamese refugee hearings, Sept. 21.

"The civilians who flee the bombed regions do not attribute their suffering to the Viet Cong. It is the 'foreigners' they hold responsible. 'If this continues,' a Saigon friend of moderate views told me, 'we will forget that the Viet Cong are Communists and finish by seeing them only as compatriots hunted down by foreigners, and we will all turn against the Americans.'"

—Georges Chaffard in *L'Express* (Paris), Sept. 26.

A Look at Other Nation's Taboos May Help to Shake Loose Our Own

(Continued from Page One)

Everyone knows the China problem is really a matter of domestic politics in our country. Everyone sees that U.S. armies are fighting on China's border in Vietnam, that we assert the right to unilateral intervention where it suits our purposes, that we seek to dominate both sides of the Pacific as well as the Atlantic, that our Navies are in the Indian ocean and the Mediterranean as well as the Caribbean. This is a poor moment to accuse China of not being peace-loving and seeking world dominion and therefore not qualifying for UN membership! Mao's 30-year-old remark as a guerrilla about power growing out of the mouth of a gun is rehearsed by us when we are demonstrating its unfortunate truth, only we substitute napalm and B-52s.

Sacred Cow and Sacred Buck

We are asking Indians and Pakistani to be rational about Kashmir but we refuse to be rational about Communism. Yet when a Hindu sees a Muslim eat beef, or a Muslim sees the erotic idols of a Hindu temple, their revulsion is deeper even than an American Rotarian's when he confronts the idea that a society should be built which does not recognize the sacred right to make an honest buck. The planet is full of "irreconcilable" quarrels which must be reconciled if the human race is to survive. That is why the UN and the building of world law and an end of the barbarism which allows any nation to embark on murder when it suits its purpose are urgent necessities.

Heavy Majority for Greater Peace Effort

The latest Gallup poll (Wash. Post, Sept. 23) should encourage the peace forces. Two questions were asked. The first was whether the person would be more or less inclined to vote for a candidate for Congress who "advocated sending a great many more men to Vietnam." The vote showed 38% less inclined, 33% more inclined, 29% no opinion. The other was whether the person would be more or less inclined to vote for a candidate who "said that we should try harder to reach a compromise peace settlement." The result showed 38% more inclined to vote for such a candidate, 14% less and 18% no opinion. Gallup noted that the two questions were not mutually exclusive since some people believe "the best way to achieve a peace settlement" is to build up the ground forces. The poll showed little difference between Republicans and Democrats. Gallup commented, "the Republicans will have a lot of selling to do if they adopt escalation of the war as party policy."

sities. But to build that safer world, the big powers must set an example. That means us, above all on the subject of China.

Goldberg was as unpersuasive on disarmament. He told the UN we were against proliferation, but we insist on the MLF which would spread nuclear weapons to Germany. He said we were for peace in space, but Johnson has just decided to let the military go ahead with their MOL project. This is the first step toward war in space, Buck Rogers style. What purpose is served by propositions so transparent?

OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

(Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Date of Filing: September 25, 1965.
2. Title of Publication: I. F. Stone's Weekly.
3. Frequency of issue: Every other Monday except last in December and first in January and bi-weekly in July and August.
4. Location of known office of publication: 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20015.
5. Location of the headquarters or general business offices of the publishers: 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20015.
6. Names and addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor: I. F. Stone, same address.
7. Owner (If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given): I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015; Esther M. Stone, same address.
8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities (If there are none, so state): none.
9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the

affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bonafide owner.

	Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 months	Single Issue Nearest To Filing Date
A. Total No. Copies Printed	23,500	26,500
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales Through Agents, News Dealers or Otherwise	1,337	1,537
2. To Term Subscribers by Mail, Carrier Delivery, or by other means	21,204	23,363
C. Total Paid Circulation	22,541	24,900
D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier De- livery, or by Other Means	100	150
E. Total No. of Copies Distributed	22,641	25,140
F. Office Use, Etc.	859	1,360
G. Total	23,500	26,500

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete. I. F. Stone, editor.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

10/4/65

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER